

ATTACHMENT II

LOUISIANA TECHNOLOGY INNOVATIONS FUND - PROGRESS REPORT

5/1/00

I DEPARTMENT/AGENCY

Louisiana Department of Education

II PROJECT TITLE

Department of Education WEB-based Data Warehouse System

III PROJECT LEADER

Steve Jungk, Department of Education, Education Data Center, 3455 Florida Blvd. Baton Rouge, La., 70806, Phone-225-342-2505, FAX 225-342-1524, sjungk@mail.doe.state.la.us

IV DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

This is a project to develop and implement a WEB-accessed Education Data Warehouse (EDW). The overall goal of the system is to improve student achievement and teacher quality by providing educational administrators and teachers access to the data they need to make effective decisions. The primary system users are district principals and teachers as well as state and district administrators. Other users include legislators, community leaders and the public at large.

V PROJECT STATUS

A. Brief Summary

RFP has been bid on and is in the proposals are process of being studied by the Evaluation Committee.

B. Accomplishments

- ?? The Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued by State Purchasing on 8/18/00 for a bid-open date of 10/6/00.
- ?? An extension to 10/27/00 was asked for by LDE.
- ?? Six proposals were received, plus one decline. One proposal was immediately judged as failing to meet the minimum mandatory requirements.
- ?? Each of the remaining proposals was reviewed in detail and it was decided that some vendor presentations were in order to clarify the Proposers' positions.

C. Problems Encountered/Action Taken or Planned

- ?? Previous delays had forced the issuance of the RFP into August instead of the planned May or June. Once the RFP was released, the level of complexity of the proposal necessitated several iterations of question-and-answers to enable the prospective vendors to determine accurately the scope of the project. Because of this and LDE's personnel constraints it was necessary to delay the bid-open date until the end of October to allow prospective bidders enough time to formulate a Proposal.
- ?? The detailed evaluation of each valid proposal necessary to select the best solution is manpower intensive and competing LDE projects serve as delays to the selection process.
- ?? The continuing hiring/budget freeze imposed on our agency reduced the available manpower we were able to muster in writing the RFP. This delayed the completion of the RFP.

D. Major Milestones (Original vs. Current Estimate)

Our original 20% completion figure was based on the issuance of the RFP sometime in May/June. The RFP was issued on 8/18/00 as detailed in previous progress reports. We had originally anticipated Proposal opening date to be sometime in July/August. The proposal opening date was rescheduled 10/6/00. This was subsequently delayed to 10/27/00 as noted above. Therefore, we believe we are approximately 2 months behind schedule at a 4% completion.

VI COST VS. BUDGET

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Budgeted</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Projected Surplus</u>
A.	Equipment	\$ none	N/A	N/A
B.	Software	\$ none	N/A	N/A
C.	Telecommunications	\$ none	N/A	N/A
D.	Professional/ Contract Services	\$ 1,000,000	none as yet	none as yet
E.	Other Costs	\$ none	N/A	N/A
		=====	=====	=====

	Total Project Cost	\$ 1,000,000	none as yet	none as yet
VII	ITEMIZED EXPENSES AND FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS INCURRED DURING THIS REPORTING PERIOD			
	None.			